



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/387,857	09/01/1999	FUMITAKA SUGAYA	1776/00039	3099

7590 08/23/2002

POLLOCK VANDE SANDE & PRIDDY
P O BOX 19088
WASHINGTON, DC 200363425

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

NOVACEK, CHRISTY L

[REDACTED]
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2822

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/387,857	SUGAYA, FUMITAKA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christy L. Novacek	2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 28-36,38-42,44 and 45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 28-31 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 32-36,38-42,44 and 45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 14 June 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/059,590.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed June 14, 2002.

Drawings

The proposed drawing corrections filed on June 14, 2002 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid **abandonment** of the application. The correction to the drawings will **not** be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Lines 9-17 of claim 32 recite the steps of forming a first conductive film electrically connected to one of the impurity diffusion layers, forming a mask pattern on the first conductive film, wherein the mask pattern has first and second openings, and using the mask pattern to etch the first conductive film such that the “first opening extends to said element isolation structure”. In Applicant’s response, Applicant states that the subject matter of claim 32 is shown in Figures 10A-10K, 12A-12E and 14A-14E. However, nowhere in any of these Figures is it shown that the first conductive layer is etched such that the “first opening extends to said element isolation structure”. Therefore, it is reasserted, as was stated in the previous Office Action, that this limitation of claim 32 lacks support in the specification.

Art Unit: 2822

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Lines 9-17 of claim 32 recite the steps of forming a first conductive film electrically connected to one of the impurity diffusion layers, forming a mask pattern on the first conductive film, wherein the mask pattern has first and second openings, and using the mask pattern to etch the first conductive film such that the “first opening extends to said element isolation structure”. In Applicant’s response, Applicant states that the subject matter of claim 32 is shown in Figures 10A-10K, 12A-12E and 14A-14E. However, nowhere in any of these Figures is it shown that the first conductive layer is etched such that the “first opening extends to said element isolation structure”. Therefore, it is reasserted, as was stated in the previous Office Action, that this limitation of claim 32 lacks support in the specification.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 42, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As amended, lines 14-15 of claim 42 recite the limitation of “the sixth step of forming a first conductive film on said insulating interlayer which fills said hole electrically connected to one of said impurity diffusion layers covering;”. This limitation does not make sense.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 36 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schoenfeld et al. (US 6,010,932, previously cited).

In reference to claim 36, Schoenfeld discloses a first conductive film (128) is formed in an insulating film region (126) on a semiconductor substrate (102) (Fig. 1). A mask pattern (130) having two openings (140/142) of different dimensions is formed on the first conductive film and the mask is used to divide the first conductive film while it is conformed to a shape of one of the openings (142) and at least one recess is simultaneously formed while the surface of the first conductive film is conformed to the shape of the other opening (Fig. 2-3; col. 4, ln. 61-col. 5, ln. 15). An insulating film (134) covers the surface of the first conductive film and a second conductive film (136) covers the insulating film (Fig. 4; col. 5, ln. 16-21).

In reference to claim 42, Schoenfeld discloses forming an element active region and an element isolation structure (104) on a semiconductor substrate (102) (Fig. 1; col. 4, ln. 19-23). A gate oxide film (106) and a gate electrode (116) are formed in the active region and an impurity is doped into the substrate in the active region to form a pair of impurity diffusion layers (108/110) in the surface of the substrate on two sides of the gate electrode (Fig. 1; col. 4, ln. 23-31). An insulating interlayer film (120/126) is formed on the entire surface of the substrate. A

Art Unit: 2822

hole is formed in the insulating interlayer film such that one of the impurity diffusion layers is exposed. A first conductive film (128) film is deposited onto the insulating interlayer film such that it fills the hole in the interlayer film and is electrically connected to one of the impurity diffusion layers (col. 4, ln. 55-58). A mask pattern (130) having first (142) and second (142) openings is formed on the first conductive film and the mask is used to divide the first conductive film below the first opening while simultaneously forming a hole through the first conductive film below the second opening until the insulating interlayer is exposed (Fig. 2-3; col. 4, ln. 61-col. 5, ln. 15). A dielectric film (134) covers the surface of the first conductive film and a second conductive film (136) covers the dielectric film (Fig. 4; col. 5, ln. 16-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori et al. (US 5,300,802, previously cited) in view of Wolf et al. (Vol. 1, previously cited).

In reference to claim 38, Komori discloses a first step of forming element active regions and element isolation structures (4) on a semiconductor substrate (1) (Fig. 2). A second step comprises forming an insulating film (6) on the substrate in the element active region (Fig. 2). A third step comprises forming a first conductive film (7A) on an entire surface including the insulating film and the element isolation structure (col. 8, ln. 7-11). In a fourth step, the first conductive film is patterned such that element isolation regions are exposed (Fig. 3, col. 8, ln. 14-15). Next, a dielectric film (8) is formed so as to cover the first conductive film and a second conductive film (9A) is formed on the dielectric film (Fig. 4; col. 8, ln. 21-35). Komori does not

Art Unit: 2822

disclose the particular steps involved in patterning the first conductive layer. Wolf discloses that the conventional method of patterning a film in semiconductor device fabrication is by photolithography, wherein a mask is formed on the film to be etched, a pattern of openings is formed in the mask by selective light irradiation, and the film is etched in the portions exposed by the mask pattern (pg. 407-408). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a conventional photolithography process to pattern the first conductive film of Komori because, in the absence of the disclosure of any particular process, one of ordinary skill in the art would look to use a conventional process to accomplish the patterning. Using a conventional photolithography process to pattern the first conductive film of Komori would involve forming a mask having at least first and second openings on the first conductive film and etching the first conductive film in the regions exposed by the openings. As can be seen in Fig. 3, the first conductive film is patterned such that element isolation regions are exposed in the areas from which the first conductive is etched away.

In reference to claim 39, after the second conductive layer is deposited, Komori discloses doping an impurity into the substrate in the element active regions to form a pair of impurity diffusion regions (11n/12n/13p/14n) on each side of the first conductive film (Fig. 6; col. 8, ln. 57-col. 9, ln. 25).

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori et al. in view of Wolf et al. (Vol. 1), as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Wolf (Vol. 2, previously cited).

In reference to claim 40, Komori does not disclose planarizing the first conductive layer by polishing. Wolf (Vol. 2) discloses that when photolithography is used to pattern IC features,

Art Unit: 2822

it is required that the imaging surface to be etched is very flat in order to obtain the maximum resolution from the photolithography etching process (last paragraph pg. 65, pg. 203). The Examiner takes official notice that chemical mechanical polishing is a well known and conventional method in the art for providing planarization of films. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to planarize the first conductive layer of Komori because, as Wolf teaches, it is required that an imaging surface be planar when it is to be subjected to a photolithographic process in order to achieve the maximum resolution from the etching process. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conduct the planarization using a polishing technique because it is a conventional method of planarization.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori et al. in view of Wolf et al., as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Eaton, Jr. et al. (US 4,570,331, previously cited)

In reference to claim 41, Komori discloses forming element isolation regions (4) by performing field oxidation (Fig. 1; col. 7, ln. 64-67). Eaton also discloses a method of forming element isolation regions. However, Eaton teaches that by using field shield isolation structures instead of field oxidation regions, the space between element active regions can be decreased, thereby decreasing the overall size of the semiconductor device (Fig. 3; col. 2, ln. 46-col. 3, ln. 42). Eaton also teaches that this decrease in the space between adjacent element active regions provides “a significant advantage” over the typical field oxidation process (col. 4, ln. 62-68). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the field shield isolation structures of Eaton for the field oxide regions of Schoenfeld

Art Unit: 2822

because Eaton teaches that field shield isolation structures are superior to field oxidation regions for the purpose of forming element isolation regions because the field shield structures allow the space between adjacent element active regions to be decreased.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenfeld et al. in view of Wolf (Vol. 2).

In reference to claim 44, Schoenfeld does not disclose planarizing the first conductive layer by polishing. Wolf (Vol. 2) discloses that when photolithography is used to pattern IC features, it is required that the imaging surface to be etched is very flat in order to obtain the maximum resolution from the photolithography etching process (last paragraph pg. 65, pg. 203). The Examiner takes official notice that chemical mechanical polishing is a well known and conventional method in the art for providing planarization of films. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to planarize the first conductive layer of Schoenfeld because, as Wolf teaches, it is required that an imaging surface be planar when it is to be subjected to a photolithographic process in order to achieve the maximum resolution from the etching process. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conduct the planarization using a polishing technique because it is a conventional method of planarization.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenfeld et al. in view of Eaton, Jr. et al.

In reference to claim 45, Schoenfeld discloses a method of forming a DRAM semiconductor device in which the element isolation regions (104) are formed by field oxidation

Art Unit: 2822

(Fig. 1; col. 4, ln. 20-25). Eaton also discloses a method of forming a DRAM structure. However, Eaton teaches that by using field shield isolation structures instead of field oxidation regions, the space between memory cells can be decreased, thereby decreasing the overall size of the semiconductor device (Fig. 3; col. 2, ln. 46-col. 3, ln. 42). Eaton also teaches that this decrease in the space between adjacent memory cells provides “a significant advantage” over the typical field oxidation process (col. 4, ln. 62-68). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the field shield isolation structures of Eaton for the field oxide regions of Schoenfeld because Eaton teaches that field shield isolation structures are superior to field oxidation regions for use in the DRAM manufacturing process because the field shield structures allow the space between adjacent memory cells to be decreased.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 14, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejection of claims 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the Examiner maintains that the limitations recited in claim 32 (particularly the limitation of etching the “first conductive film” such that the “first opening extends to said element isolation structure”), lacks support in the specification.

Regarding the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schoenfeld, the Examiner maintains that the reference meets all limitations recited in the claim. Concerning the Schoenfeld reference, Applicants argue, “recesses such as 144, do not constitute a hole, or opening”. On the contrary, the recesses 144 of Schoenfeld meet the claim limitation of

Art Unit: 2822

"at least one recess in a surface of said divided first conductive film", while the openings in the first conductive layer which separate adjacent capacitors (NOT recesses 144) meet the claim limitation of "dividing said first conductive film conforming to a shape of one of said openings so as to reach said insulating film region".

Regarding the rejection of claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schoenfeld, the Examiner maintains that the reference meets all limitations recited in the claim. It is the openings in the first conductive layer which separate adjacent capacitors (corresponding to the openings 142 of the mask) of Schoenfeld which meet the claim limitations of "dividing first conductive film below said first opening, and simultaneously forming a hole extending through said first conductive film below said second opening, said first conductive film is etched until said insulating interlayer is exposed in said first opening".

Regarding the rejection of claims 38 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Wolf (Vol. 1), Examiner maintains that the references, in combination, meet all limitations recited in the claim. Applicants argue, "[T]he feature of using the element isolation structure as a stopper to divide the first conductive film below the first opening, and simultaneously forming a hole below the second opening, does not appear to be disclosed in either reference." Komori discloses that the first conductive film (7A) is formed by depositing a silicon film "on the whole substrate surface" and then it is "patterned into a predetermined shape". Komori does not disclose what type of process is to be used for patterning the silicon film into the predetermined shape. The Wolf reference is combined with the Komori reference because Wolf discloses that the conventional method of patterning a film in semiconductor device fabrication is by photolithography, wherein a mask is formed on the

Art Unit: 2822

film to be etched, a pattern of openings is formed in the mask by selective light irradiation, and the film is etched in the portions exposed by the mask pattern. Neither the Komori reference nor the Wolf reference suggests any reason to etch the openings in a way other than simultaneously. In so far as Applicants' argument that the element isolation structure is used as a stopper, the Examiner points out that this limitation is not in the claim. Claim 38 recites etching the first conductive layer "until said element isolation structure is exposed". Komori meets this limitation in so far as, the element isolation structure (4) is exposed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christy L. Novacek whose telephone number is (703) 308-5840. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30 - 5:00.

Art Unit: 2822

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on (703) 308-4940. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

CLN
August 20, 2002



Stephen D. Meier
Primary Examiner